

**WILLIAMSBURG
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES
Tuesday, August 23, 2005**

CALL TO ORDER AND ATTENDANCE

The regular semimonthly Architectural Review Board meeting was held on Tuesday, August 23, 2005, at 6:30 p.m. in the third Floor Conference Room of the Municipal Building.

Chairman Williams called the meeting to order. Present in addition to Mr. Williams were Board members Mr. Klee, Mr. Lane, Mr. Spence, Mr. Hertzler and Mr. Watson. None were absent. Also present was Zoning Officer Beck and Zoning Administrator Murphy.

ARB #05-067 Culp/703 Page Street – Exterior Change (replace garage door on detached garage) – Approved.

ARB

SIGN #05-025 Stephanos/110 South Henry Street – Freestanding & Building Mounted Signs – Approved.

Mr. Williams motioned to approve the consent agenda with the removal of ARB #05-068 for further review at the applicant's request.

Recorded vote on the motion:

Aye: Mr. Lane, Mr. Williams, Mr. Spence, Mr. Hertzler, Mr. Watson.

Nay: None.

Absent: None.

Abstain: Mr. Klee and Mr. Spence – ARB Sign #05-025.

ARCHITECTURAL PRESERVATION DISTRICT

ARB #05-068 Edwards & Lyon/800 South Henry Street – Exterior Change (siding, doors, windows, shutters and front porch posts)

Mr. Williams noted the applicants requested removal from the consent agenda to present details on the brackets for the front porch. Mr. Lyon noted he researched houses built around the same time period and presented the Board with a model of a scroll bracket that he thought best suited his house with a picture of the same scroll brackets on a house in Connecticut of the same vintage. The Board agreed that the scroll bracket was suitable for the architectural style of the dwelling. Mr. Lyons asked if fixed or adjustable wooden louvers would be appropriate for his house. Mr. Klee stated either operable or fixed louvered shutters would be fine. Other Board members concurred.

Mr. Williams motioned to approve ARB #05-068 with fixed or adjustable louvers for the shutters and the scroll brackets for the front porch as presented at the meeting.

Recorded vote on the motion:

Aye: Mr. Lane, Mr. Williams, Mr. Spence, Mr. Hertzler, Mr. Watson and Mr. Klee.
Nay: None.
Absent: None.
Abstain: None.

SIGNS

ARB

SIGN #05-030 7-11 Store/1202 Jamestown Road – Monument Sign

John Manley presented the request for a new 24 square foot 7-Eleven monument sign eight feet in height noting the original sign was removed by VDOT during the widening of Route 199. He noted the proposed sign face is the same as the sign that was removed with green lettering and a white background.

Board members noted the *Design Review Guidelines* require the white background to be opaque. Mr. Williams suggested an opaque dark green background, white lettering with a dark green sign base instead of brown. Other Board members concurred with Mr. Manley agreeing to the proposed changes.

Mr. Williams motioned to approved ARB Sign #05-030 conditioned upon a dark green opaque background, white lettering and a dark green base.

Recorded vote on the motion:

Aye: Mr. Lane, Mr. Williams, Mr. Spence, Mr. Hertzler, Mr. Watson and Mr. Klee.
Nay: None.
Absent: None.
Abstain: None.

CONCEPTUAL REVIEW

ARB #05-069 Rita's Water Ice/Monticello Shopping Center – New freestanding building (located in parking lot adjacent to Mountain Mudd Espresso kiosk, 222 Monticello Avenue)

William & Valery Pawlak presented their conceptual request for an 800 to 1,000 square feet Rita Water Ice noting the following:

- Brick walls to match the shopping center colors.
- White exterior steel fire safe doors.
- White aluminum frame vinyl coated service windows.
- White vinyl trim.
- White Aluminum K style gutter and 2X3 downspouts.

- Green 30 yr asphalt commercial roof.
- Green or white gooseneck lamps.
- Four foot wide concrete walkway around the building.
- Twelve foot concrete deck with painted six inch filled concrete bollards four foot on center around entire deck.
- Metal mesh benches on the deck.
- Sunbrella Canvas Awning, red and white stripe over the windows and doors.
- Landscaping around the building.

Mr. Pawlak asked if the gables should be Hardiplank or stucco. Board members agreed that Hardiplank would look better than stucco. A discussion followed concerning landscaping, gooseneck lamps, deck, bollards, and sidewalk proposed for the building with Board members agreeing the applicant was on the right track and look forward to final plans which must include a site plan of the project.

Mr. Williams motioned to conceptually approve ARB #05-069 with the applicant providing final plans, details and a site plan for the project with the final submittal.

Recorded vote on the motion:

Aye: Mr. Lane, Mr. Williams, Mr. Spence, Mr. Hertzler, Mr. Watson and Mr. Klee.
Nay: None.
Absent: None.
Abstain: None.

Minutes August 9, 2005

The minutes were approved as presented.

Other

Continued Discussion of Design Review Guideline Subcommittee Comments & Issues for the Architectural Review Board to make recommendations and report back to the Committee

Guiding Principle

The most restrictive guidelines should be adjacent to the Colonial Williamsburg Historic Area, the old campus of William & Mary, and the National Register Historic Districts of Pollard Park and Chandler Court. ***It was the consensus of the Board that the Guiding Principle was acceptable.***

Map Revisions

1. The Architectural Preservation District should be concentrated around the Colonial Williamsburg Historic Area.
 - The AP District on South Henry Street one lot south of Mimosa Drive should be changed to CP District. The boundary line adjacent to Richmond Hill, the Coves, and Port Anne should be one building lot deep from South Henry Street. **Board members agreed that the area one lot south of Mimosa Drive to Route 199 should be designated a Corridor Protection District.**
 - Should the portion of South Henry Street between South Boundary and one lot south of Mimosa Drive be changed to CP District, or included in an AP Zone 2 or 3? The draft of the 2005 Comprehensive Plan recommends that the existing Medium Density Multifamily land use for this area (8 dwelling units/net acre) should be changed to the new Downtown Residential land use (with 8 units/net acre as the base density and an ability to increase to 22 units/net acre with a special use permit). This proposed change supports the redevelopment of this section of South Henry Street. **It was the consensus of the Board that this area should be located in AP Zone 2. The rationale for recommending AP Zone 2 was that the older buildings (50 years old or older) should be photographed and recorded before their demolition since this area was an African American working class community at the turn of the century. Even though these buildings are modest in size and materials it is important to record and photograph these buildings before demolition to allow a record to be maintained to indicate the types of buildings historically located in this area of Williamsburg. Citizens from the area also recommended that four lots adjacent to South Henry Street on Mimosa Drive be added to the AP-2 District since these dwellings are 50 years old or older.**
 - The AP District on South England Street south of Colonial Extension Subdivision should be changed to CP District. **Board members agreed with this revision.**
 - The AP District on Capitol Landing Road between the Colonial Parkway and Brandywyne should be changed to CP District. The boundary line adjacent to Brandywyne should be one building lot deep from Capitol Landing Road. The AP District would remain on both sides of Capitol Landing Road between Brandywyne and Queens Creek. **Board members agreed with this recommendation.**
2. The Corridor Protection District should be revised where needed to reflect recent development.

- Holly Hills Carriage Homes adjacent to Rt. 199 (make the CP boundary one duplex deep from Rt. 199)
- Holly Hills Phase 1 adjacent to Rt. 199 (make the CP boundary one lot deep from Rt. 199)
- Penniman Road (move CP/AP boundary line to follow with Penniman Road)
- High Street Williamsburg adjacent to Richmond Road (move CP boundary line for the commercial section back to Middle Street)
- Mooretown Road (eliminate from CP District)

Board members agreed with these recommendations.

Text Revision

1. Architectural review should not be required for Planned Unit Developments located outside of the AP and CP Districts (Sec. 21-864). This would eliminate the requirement for architectural review for Shellis Square on Merrimac Trail, for Port Anne except for the lots along South Henry Street, and for Counselors Close. ***Board members agreed with this recommendation.***

List of Locally Significant Architecture and Areas

1. The list of Locally Significant Architecture and Areas includes buildings 50 years old and older located in the Architectural Preservation District. The list was prepared in December 1992, and was based on a survey of all buildings 50 years old and older. The survey needs to be updated based on the revised boundaries of the AP District.
2. The Architectural Review section of the Zoning Ordinance does not refer to a list of locally significant architecture and areas, but refers to the historical and architectural value of a building or structure. The list of Locally Significant Architecture and Areas was an attempt to identify those buildings in the Architectural Preservation District with the highest historical and architectural value.
3. Should the Board update and continue to use the list of Locally Significant Architecture and Areas, or instead just use the survey of all buildings 50 years old and older as a resource in evaluating requests? If the survey is used instead of the list of Locally Significant Architecture and Areas, should the survey be supplemented by a rating of the most important buildings, such as National Register listing or eligibility?

Board members recommend that a list be maintained that contains historic structures or areas on the National Register or those that qualify for the National Register based on three criteria that allow a structure or area to be located on the National Register. They recommend that the list be based on the Frazier and Associates Reconnaissance Architectural Survey Report

(1992) which recommended the following structures or areas being qualified for National Register Nominations:

Potential Individual Nominations based on the 1992 Frazier and Associates Reconnaissance Architectural Survey Report

- ***Basset Hall, 522 East Francis Street***
- ***William Byrd House, 410 West Francis Street***
- ***Rabon House, 426 Ireland Street***
- ***Frank Powell House, 520 Jamestown Road***
- ***Bowen-Armistead House, 207 West Duke of Gloucester Street***
- ***Dora Armistead House, 320 North Henry Street***
- ****Matthew Whaley School, 301 Scotland Street (Has been on the National Register since 2004)***
- ***Bruton Heights School, 301 First Street***
- ***Transportation Center, 468 North Boundary Street***
- ***The Beeches, 1030 Capitol Landing Road***
- ****The Williamsburg Inn, 300 East Francis Street (Has been on the National Register since 1997)***
- ***The Craft House, 305 South England Street***

Potential Historic Districts

- ***Merchants Square/Prince George Street Commercial District***
- ***College Terrace/West Williamsburg Heights***
- ****Chandler Court (Has been on the National Register since 1996)***
- ****Pollard Park (Has been on the National Register since 1996)***
- ***Braxton Court***

The Board recommends the above because a professional has provided information and criteria for each of these structures and areas. For structures not listed above, the Board recommends that a list be maintained of all structures in the Architectural Preservation District 50 years old or older.

Staff noted that buildings that have reached 50 years or older since the last survey was conducted will need to be surveyed.

Architectural Preservation District Revisions – Reconfigure APD zones 1, 2 and 3

1. The most restrictive guidelines should be adjacent to the Colonial Williamsburg Historic Area, the old campus of William & Mary, and the National Register Historic Districts of Pollard Park and Chandler Court. The boundaries of the three zones should be redrawn to reflect this policy.
Board members agreed with this recommendation.
2. APD zone 1 (see attached map)

- No replacement of existing wood siding with synthetic siding. ***Board members agreed that wood siding should not be replaced with synthetic siding.***
 - Metal siding, stucco and drivit, aluminum and vinyl siding shall not be allowed for new construction. ***It was the consensus of Board members that metal siding, stucco and drivit, aluminum and vinyl siding shall not be allowed for new construction.***
 - Existing metal siding, stucco and drivit, aluminum and vinyl siding may be replaced in kind. ***Board members noted that metal siding, stucco and drivit, aluminum and vinyl siding may be replaced in kind. However, if not replaced in kind then the new siding must be wood.***
 - Should new construction be allowed to use synthetic siding and/or trim that resembles authentic horizontal wood siding? ***It was the consensus of Board members that synthetic siding should not be allowed for new construction in the redefined APD zone 1.***
3. APD zone 2 (see attached map)
- Should existing wood siding be allowed to be replaced with synthetic siding that resembles authentic horizontal wood siding. If so, what are the parameters?
 - If the List of Significant Structures is continued, buildings on the list could be required to be reviewed on a case-by-case basis, with approval based on setback from street, amount of deteriorated siding, and/or other parameters.
 - If the List of Significant Structures is replaced with a survey of buildings 50 years old and older, would review on a case-by-case basis be warranted?
 - If the List of Significant Structures is replaced with a survey of buildings 50 years old or older, supplemented by identification of buildings listed on or eligible for listing on the National Register, buildings so identified could be required to be reviewed on a case-by-case basis, with approval based on setback from street, amount of deteriorated siding, and/or other parameters.***It was the consensus of Board members that existing wood siding should not be replaced with synthetic siding.***
 - New construction can use synthetic siding that resembles authentic horizontal wood siding. ***It was the consensus of Board members that a cementitious siding that resembles wood could be used for new construction.***
 - Metal siding, stucco and drivit, aluminum and vinyl siding shall not be allowed for new construction. ***It was the consensus of Board members that metal siding, stucco and drivit, aluminum and vinyl siding shall not be allowed for new construction.***

- Existing metal siding, stucco and drivit, aluminum and vinyl siding may be replaced in kind. **Board members noted that metal siding, stucco and drivit, aluminum and vinyl siding may be replaced in kind. However, if not replaced in kind then the new siding must be wood.**
- 4. APD zone 3 (see attached map)
 - Existing wood siding can be replaced with synthetic siding that resembles authentic horizontal wood siding (i.e. cementitious siding). **Board members were in agreement that a cementitious siding that resembles wood could be used to replace wood siding.**
 - Vinyl siding meeting certain quality standards can be approved on a case-by-case basis. Review current standards for vinyl siding and amplify if necessary. **The Board was in agreement with this recommendation for new construction.**
 - Metal siding, stucco and drivit, and aluminum siding shall not be allowed for new construction. **It was the consensus of Board members that metal siding, stucco and drivit, and aluminum siding shall not be allowed for new construction.** Existing metal siding, stucco and drivit, aluminum and vinyl siding may be replaced in kind. **Board members noted that metal siding, stucco and drivit, and aluminum siding may be replaced in kind. However, if not replaced in kind then the new siding shall be wood, cementitious siding or vinyl siding meeting the above criteria.**

Board members want to encourage property owners in the Architectural Preservation District to replace noncontributing siding and materials with materials that are appropriate for the building and recommend the City consider incentives such as a property tax abatement program or “Architectural Preservation Medallion” as an incentive for property owners. A copy of a letter sent to City Council on December 14, 2004 from the Architectural Review Board is attached which outlines such a proposal.

Corridor Protection District (see attached map)

1. Should the current unified standard for building design be continued?
 - Major buildings should be constructed of brick or brick and horizontal siding that is wood or a synthetic siding that resembles authentic horizontal wood siding.
 - Prefabricated metal buildings shall not be allowed.
 - Aluminum siding, vinyl siding and sheeted siding shall not be allowed.
 - Applied stucco is not acceptable as a primary building material, but may be used as an accent material on buildings of contemporary design or in renovations.

Board members strongly agreed that the current building design standards should be continued to maintain and improve the architectural and visual character of the entrance corridors into the City.

2. Should there be a specific standard for residential uses in the CP District?
 - Other than Jamestown Road, residential uses in the CP District are duplexes, apartments and condominiums, which are adequately handled by the existing guidelines. There have been no problems in dealing with the single-family residential buildings on Jamestown Road.

Board members agreed that a separate standard for residential and commercial areas and uses in the Corridor Protection District was not necessary. The focus on the Corridors is the general visual character of the areas into the City, not one use versus another use.

3. Should there be a different standard for different sections of the CP District, such as Jamestown Road west of Rt. 199?
 - Are there any issues other than the use of vinyl siding?
 - If vinyl siding is the only issue:
 - Are there areas of the CP District where vinyl siding would be appropriate?
 - If there are areas where vinyl siding would be appropriate, should a specific quality of vinyl siding be required?

Board members strongly agreed that standards should be the same for all properties located in the Corridor Protection District and that one side of a street was just as important as another side if located in the City.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 8:35 P.M.

Jason L. Beck
Zoning Officer